

level;

code to match the first security clearance level with the second security clearance level to determine an appropriate overall clearance level;

code to match the request message and the overall clearance level with a second portion of the user's personal information; and

code to securely transmit the second portion of the user's personal information.

P6
AB
cont

27. (New) The computer-executable program code of claim 26, further comprising:

code to authenticate the request message.

28. (New) The computer-executable program code of claim 26, further comprising:

code to establish a secure audit trail of each access of the user's personal information.

29. (New) The computer-executable program code of claim 28, wherein the code to establish a secure audit trail includes code to record an identifier to identify the requester.

30. (New) The computer-executable program code of claim 28, wherein the code to establish the secure audit trail is configured to execute in a secure computer kernel.

REMARKS

In a First Office Action dated April 18, 2000, the Examiner made a restriction requirement between two groups of claims, Group I (claims 1-5) and Group II (claim 6). Further, the Examiner rejected all the claims 1-5 in the elected group as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants have carefully reviewed the outstanding Office Action. The present

response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in a condition for Allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-30 are currently pending in this case. Of these, claims 1-5 were rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 6 is canceled without prejudice in this response, as being directed toward a non-elected group. New claims 7-30, including new independent claims 25 and 26 are added with this response.

Restriction Requirement

In a telephone conversation with Examiner Barrón on April 10, 2000, Applicants made a provisional election with traverse and elected to prosecute Group I (claims 1-5). Accordingly, Applicants hereby affirm the election and withdraw claim 6 from consideration, but reserve the right to rejoin this independent claim at a later stage of prosecution, or prosecute this claim in a divisional, continuation, or continuation-in-part application.

Telephone Interview with the Examiner on May 02, 2000

Applicants thank Examiner Barrón for the courtesies shown during a telephone interview on May 02, 2000. Examiner has instructed the applicants to present their reasons for a favorable reconsideration in a written form.

Amendment to the Specification

Certain English language syntax errors and other typographical errors are corrected in the specification. The change on page 18, line 26 is made to correct a typographical error, which change is believed to be proper in view of the sentence immediately following the changed text. No new matter is added as a result of these corrections. Examiner is respectfully requested to enter these amendments.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Perry in view of Smith

In the First Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 1–5 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Perry et al. (USP 5,241,466) in view of Smith (USP 4,956,769). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view that Perry and Smith either individually or in combination do not teach the combination of acts recited in the instant claimed invention. For example, neither Perry nor Smith teaches "assigning at least one of a plurality of security levels to each information object". Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Perry and Smith do not anticipate or render obvious any of the claims currently pending.

Perry is directed toward creating a central depository for secure storage and rapid retrieval of important documents and information such as living wills, and durable powers of attorney. See col. 2, lines 31–36. Scanned documents are stored in an optical storage device connected to an optical scanner. See col. 2, lines 38–40. Other information is entered into a data storage facilities connected to a computer. See col. 2, lines 42–44. Authorized request for information and documents are processed and the appropriate information and documents retrieved and transmitted to the person making the request. See col. 2, lines 44–54. As the Examiner pointed out in his Office Action, Perry does not teach "assigning at least one of a plurality of security levels to each information object."

Smith is directed toward an "occurrence level value-based" security protection system that offers "additional protection to existing protection schemes." See col. 1, lines 50–54. In Smith, a user's request to input or output information to or from a database is limited to selected users and terminal locations and operations on selected data records and data fields of the databases. See col. 1, line 57 to col. 2, line 2. But Smith does not teach "assigning at least one of a plurality of security levels to each information object" as claimed in the instant application.

The Examiner stated that Smith mentions in the "Background of the Invention" section that computer security is needed because "more of the chores of managing our personal and business activities" are assigned to computers. See col. 1, lines 24–47. It is respectfully submitted that a general statement that computers or the data contained in them ought to be secured because they were used for "personal . . . activities" does not suggest, motivate or render obvious the combination of elements or acts as claimed in the instant application.

Amendment to Claim 1

While continuing to traverse the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), claim 1 is amended to conform to the conventions of standard usage of the English language by using a possessive form of the noun "user," and to correct a typographical error by inserting the word —and— at the end of the penultimate act, and before the act of "securely transmitting the information object to the requester." The latter is done to comply with the PTO rules.

New Claims

New claims 7–30 are added. Of these, claims 7–24 depend on the independent claim 1 and therefore are believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 25 is written in a step-plus-function form with the express intention of invoking the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6 to interpret that claim alone.

Claim 26 is directed toward a computer-executable code configured to perform the acts in claim 1, and is supported by the Specification. Claims 27–30 depend on claim 26 and are supported by the Specification. No new matter is added.

Conclusion

Applicants have carefully reviewed the remaining art cited by the Examiner and

have found it not to adversely affect the patentability of the instant invention. It is believed that a fee of \$90.00 is due pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.16(c). A new Fee Determination Record is enclosed in duplicate. A check for \$90.00 is enclosed herewith.



In view of these Remarks, all currently pending claims are believed to be in a condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. A prompt Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:  44,602
Naren Chaganti, (Reg. No.)
524 Kendall Ave, #5
Palo Alto, CA 94306
(650) 813-9932

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this document, and any other document that is referred to as being attached or enclosed, is deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" in an envelope with sufficient postage, the envelope being addressed to the Commissioner of Patents & Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Date: 5-19-2000

By: 

Name: NAREN CHAGANTI
(Name of person mailing)